Carolyn Rouse
Department of Anthropology
Princeton University
Ethnografeast
Lisbon, Portugal
June 2007

CONFERENCE PAPER -- PLEASE DO NOT CITE

STAKEHOLDERS VS. INTERLOCUTORS: TRANSLATING ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH INTO PUBLIC POLICY SPEAK[1]

What should ethnographers do with the disciplinary practice of cultural relativism in a world of great suffering? Loïc Wacquant argues in "The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration," that researchers should worry less about interpretation and start producing descriptive ethnographies.[2] He argues, "Advocates of 'state-centered' approaches to social inequality have concentrated their attention on the welfare, health, housing, labor and educational arms of the state, to the remarkable neglect of the conception, deployment and effects of penal policies and institutions."[3] While Wacquant argues that sociologists must begin to recognize the theoretical within the descriptive, anthropologists including Nancy Scheper-Hughes, Philippe Bourgois, and Paul Farmer have been arguing that description is not enough. In the introduction to *Violence in War and Peace*, Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois write scathingly that, "the contribution of anthropology to understanding all levels of violence – from individual sexual abuse and homicide to state-sponsored political terrorism and 'dirty' wars to genocide is extremely modest. And those who have deviated from the golden rule of

[1] To reflect the ultimate focus of the paper, the title should be "Reconsidering Suffering and the Social Indebtedness of Ethnographers in the Field"
[2] Loïc Wacquant, "The curious eclipse of prison ethnography in the age of mass incarceration," In *Ethnography*, 3(4), 371-397 (2002).
[3] Ibid, P. 389.

moral relativism are often saddled with accusations of victim-blaming by advocates of a bourgeois politics of representation…"[4]

Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois would never characterize Wacquant's descriptive precision as an elision of the moral and social "so what?" question. But by relaxing the interpretive gaze and privileging thick description, Wacquant does not translate the value of his observations for policy makers.[5] Instead, Wacquant is read and cited by legal scholars such as Dorothy Roberts, Rachel Moran, Cheryl Harris, and Kimberle Crenshaw whose minds Wacquant does not have to change. So in the case of Wacquant his descriptive ethnographies are helpful for people with the power to unmake suffering, but his work does not directly affect social change. In other words, Wacquant's work does the intellectual work that Scheper-Hughes, Bourgois, and Farmer find insufficient as a tool against violence.

Scheper-Hughes has proposed an anthropology of suffering, a kind of theodicy that seeks to locate the social and cultural origins of poverty, violence, preventable illness and death. Within this paper I describe a project I have begun that attempts to take seriously this proposed anthropology of suffering. Theoretically I take issue with some of the ethical presuppositions that Scheper-Hughes brings to bare on the subject of suffering, so my project is designed to address some of my concerns. I start, for example, from the position that the ethical is not prior to culture.[6] Epicurus' (341-270 BCE) trilemma states, "Is he [God] willing to prevent evil, but not able? then is he impotent. Is he able, but not willing? then is he malevolent. Is he both able and willing? whence then is evil?"[7]

---

[4] "Introduction," Nancy Scheper-Hughes and Philippe Bourgois, In *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004, P. 6.
[5] Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," In *The Interpretations of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books), Pp. 3-30.
[6] Nancy Scheper-Hughes, *Death Without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), Pp. 21-23.
[7] The Problem of Evil: A Reader, edited by Mark Larrimore (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), P. xix.

Epicurus discovers that the problem is not that the gods are disturbed by evil, but that evil disturbs us. Evil is a cultural and individual construct, in other words it starts and ends with culture and individuals, not the gods.

Philosophical trilemmas aside, there are a number of reasons why the anthropology of suffering should not abandon cultural relativism, the ethical and methodological foundation of our discipline.[8] The most important reason is that judging our subjects against the ethical and moral principles of a handful of Western philosophers reintroduces issues of representation that have been extensively critiqued in the literature. I think applying the disciplinary approach of cultural relativism to the anthropology of suffering could produce one of the most theoretically rich subdisicplines.

My project is a longitudinal study of a village in Ghana. The nickname for the project is Extreme Village Makeover since my goal is to actually try to produce a new structural reality that is both desired by the community and sustainable.

The process of trying to get this project off the ground is very revealing of the compromises and uncertainties that make Scheper-Hughes, Bourgois, and Farmer's mandate for anthropological moral activism quite problematic. I have had to 1. Confront my own motivations which are not pure. 2. Disentangle neocolonial discourses from what I will call "do-gooder development speak," and 3. Recognize the material and structural issues limiting the scope and value of my project. At the end of the paper, I propose a

[8] In his article "Anti-Anti Relativism," Clifford Geertz finds a number of problems with critiques of relativism. Anti-relativists, he argues often presume that relativists do not believe in anything, as if they have no moral compass, or consider all things to be equal. "The notion that someone who does not hold your views holds the reciprocal of them, or simply hasn't got any, has, whatever its comforts for those afraid reality is going to go away unless we believe very hard in it, not conduced to much in the way of clarity in the anti-relativist discussion…" (Pg. 44). Cultural relativism was used to attack racialism, but is now criticized for promoting racialism. Using the discipline as a platform to promulgate a social agenda seems to Geertz to be a misuse of anthropology. In the end we prove nothing only that we had an opinion. Geertz also argues that much of the debate about cultural relativism is really uneasiness with cultural practices that Americans find abhorrent (p. 45). *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

way of revisioning a self-reflexive anthropology that is activist while simultaneously recognizing the ways in which that activism produces problematic hegemonic authority.

Motivation

Extreme Village Makeover was a project conceived while tearing up over yet another Extreme Makeover: Home Edition, a television show that airs on ABC. Over a brief period a couple years ago, I watched several episodes of Extreme Home Makeover,[9] a sentimental show about beneficence and family renewal. The show always begins with a team of builders "surprising" a desperate family that has suffered horrific tragedies. The receiving family usually gets a one-week all expense paid vacation to Disney World, an affiliate of ABC. While consuming cotton candy in suburban simulacra, a team of carpenters and home decorators tears down and then rebuilds the desperate family's home.[10] The family returns to a completely renovated house supplied with appliances from Sears. The children's rooms reflect the children's passions from astronomy to Disney princesses, and some parents are given Sears tools and space to practice hobbies. The audience is left hoping that the material restoration of the home brings personal restoration to each member of the family.

At the time I was introduced to Extreme Makeover: Home Edition, I had been studying what I call "discourses of suffering." My work examines the ways in which suffering caused by sickle cell disease is articulated by medical professionals as a means for improving healthcare access. Discourses of suffering are political and strategic, and are used in the service of what Hannah Arendt describes as the politics of pity (Arendt 1963).[11] Extreme Home Makeover uses the politics of pity to narrativize a simple story of redemption and salvation where goodness finally wins.

[9] I shorten Extreme Makeover: Home Edition to Extreme Home Makeover.
[10] Jean Baudrillard, "Simulacra and simulations," In *Selected Writings*, edited by Mark Poster (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988), P. 166-184.
[11] Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution* (New York: Penguin Books, 1963), Pp. 88-98.

There are a number of reasons to be critical of the show, from the staging and product placement to the censorship of anything that does not fit into the exaggerated narrative of heroes rescuing innocent victims. First, one can only imagine what happens to families who cannot afford to have their $1,500 Pacific Blue Kenmore Elite Front Loader Washer fixed or replaced. Do they sell some of their non-essential new home furnishings in order to repair the essential ones? Building an expensive home does not change a family's earning potential, and so many families become straddled with a white elephant. In fact, the Trenton *Star-Ledger* reported on Beverly Turner, the adoptive mother of 12 disabled children and young adults who after her extreme home makeover was unable to pay the taxes on her new 6,000 square foot home.[12] Her once $37,000 home was reassessed at $1 million in a state with the highest property taxes. Using the effective tax rate for Trenton, New Jersey in 2006, I calculated that Mrs. Turner's annual tax bill went from about $1,200 to $32,000 which is probably close to what she earns in order to care for a house full of disabled children.

Second, the rebuilt house does not just affect the individual family owner, it affects the neighbors and the family's social network as well. What happens in poor neighborhoods when all of a sudden the Jones' have a solar heated pool, a gourmet kitchen, and a complete set of Sears tools in their new two car garage? Considering the requirements to circulate wealth within poor extended family networks, what new social obligations does the family incur?[13] Extreme Home Makeover tests the limits of empowerment through material enrichment.

Yet the show touches the souls of people like me who want to redeem themselves through social activism and who like physician-anthropologist Paul Farmer want to

---

[12] Tom Hester, "A taxing situation for a tireless woman," In *The Star-Ledger*, Tuesday, October 17, 2006.
[13] Carol Stack, "Swapping," In *All Our Kin* (New York: Basic Books, 1974), Pp. 32-44.

redistribute material and social capital. So while I am very critical of Extreme Home Makeover, it is the model that I employed when conceiving my project.

From the start, my selfish career aspirations and do-gooder desires could not be disentangled. Before I left for Ghana last summer, I knew that the village had to be close to a major city. I had connections to a village 100 kilometers from the capital Accra and 5 kilometers from a paved road. The village had been "adopted" by a Princeton center. The community is deserving and needy and had already welcomed help, but I realized the entire project would be paving a road. The project would aid the community, but the location would not be suitable for a longitudinal research study and accompanying documentary. I wanted a village not just of suffering people, but of people who I had easy access to, and whose village could undergo dramatic changes in a short time. I needed something sexier. And why Ghana? Because they speak English which means the film would not need subtitles, and Princeton University students in different disciplines could participate in the project without extensive language training.

Pragmatism is always a factor in deciding where to conduct field research. Clifford Geertz is known to have chosen Morocco and Bali because they were safe places for his children. But in the case of the anthropology of suffering, the decision of where to intervene to improve the lives of the poor should perhaps be determined by a stakeholders needs assessment and other tools used by non-governmental organizations (NGOs), economists, and policy experts. The problem is the language and tools of development are often neocolonial and paternalistic.

Perhaps what Farmer et. al. are saying is that the duty of every anthropologist is to act whenever they witness suffering caused by structural violence. But act in what way? Is it enough for an anthropologist to write about what he or she witnessed and name those responsible? But what if that requires ignoring the ethical obligations of the discipline in

order to reveal confidential information or expose informants? Such actions threaten fieldsite access, and there are a number of these cases in the history of anthropology. In the 1980s a graduate student who documented forced abortions in China affectively closed China to anthropologists for a decade. Paul Farmer has developed a different approach which is to refrain from blaming individuals within the local population. He denounces instead those with the power to affect substantial change. This strategy does not compromise access to his fieldsite, but it does compromise the quality of the ethnography. Characterizing the poor as innocent victims who lack agency has shades of paternalism.[14]

While I am critical of how Farmer avoids unpacking the messy cultural forces at play in the reproduction of inequality in Haiti, his call for anthropologists to reflect on how they are embedded in relations of inequality makes sense. For those like me who want to be proactive in a culturally relativist way, we need to develop our own "needs assessment" tools that are attentive to local culture; that consider the agency of the people within the community; that consider potential long-term consequences of our involvement; and that recognize our role within the local exchange economy. There is an extensive body of literature on the fieldwork experiences of anthropologists who have intervened from Franz Boas who changed the way Americans understood race and culture to John Jackson who has written about his experiences in Harlem producing

[14] In describing his subject position, Paul Farmer writes that he is unapologetically on "the side of the destitute sick" (Farmer 2003, 26). Why the destitute sick and not just the destitute? Earlier Farmer says, "A focus on health alters human rights discussions in important and underexplored ways: the right to health is perhaps the least contested social right…" (Farmer 2003, 19). So he notes his allegiance to the destitute sick who are innocent victims of physical suffering first, and systems second, but what about the destitute well? The destitute suffer from poverty, but because they are well they have agency and power. Their agency makes it difficult for human rights activists to tap into what Farmer describes as the public's vein of "enthusiasm and commitment" (Farmer 2003, 19). But what about enthusiasm for the poor who grow marijuana for recreation, or who perform poorly in school, or who have multiple sex partners? Is it impossible to have debates about social justice that do not rely on extremes of good and evil? My interventionist anthropology attempts to alleviate suffering at the same time that it recognizes the suffering is culturally elaborated and that people are complicated.

videos for his interlocutors. In order to begin to develop this subdiscipline focusing on suffering, we need an extensive review of the literature and oral accounts of what ethnographers do in the field that embeds them in their community. I know ethnographers who have bailed their informants out of jail, given them money to escape an abusive spouse, or given them a car, as I did. And we need to think seriously about how and why these acts of intervention did or did not alleviate suffering.

Extreme Village Makeover

Theorists are baffled as to why some development programs work and others fail. They are particularly concerned about why huge development packages have not helped the GDP of some of the poorest countries. Without an analysis of how different types of gifting and forms of exchange operate within systems of inequality, anthropologists will never be able to help push development discourse out of the realm of neocolonialism. Mauss describes how gift exchange produces in the recipient a sense of obligation.[15] What happens when the gift is not supposed to produce a connection to the giver, but is supposed to change how the community operates? And what if the demands for change disrupt the existing social networks and exchange flows? For example, what happens when those who give aid demand that the community adopt private property ownership, or relax forms of social indebtedness? By focusing on forms of exchange, indebtedness, and reciprocity my project will reflect on how my actions to alleviate suffering affect the dynamics of a community, and contribute, perhaps to new forms of suffering.

The first village I visited was Tamo. Tamo is a sparsely populated, 14,000 acre agricultural community outside the port city of Tema. The community center, the only building marking a "downtown," is surrounded by miles of loamy dirt roads. In many respects the community is thriving. The 1,200 residents grow an abundance of tomatoes,

---

[15] Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*, Translated by W. D. Hall (New York: W.W. Norton, 1990)

cassava, pepper, okra, and sweet potatoes. They also raise goats, cattle and sheep. Jobs outside farming include petty trading, teaching, masonry, and driving. But the community is at a crossroads. A long drought has reduced crop yields, and the dams, which could have reduced the affects of the drought, need repairing. Tamo is not hooked up to the grid, it needs a clinic, potable water, pipe lines, capital improvements to the schools, and a library.

I met the chief and village leaders outside the community center before we convened into a large circular room. The room had eight foot tall windows providing an almost 360 degree view of the dusty savannah. The architecture revealed a sense of style and tradition, and anticipated a future unencumbered by the present material limitations of the country. This was a common theme in Ghanaian architecture. I, for example, had an enormous jazzcuzi tub in my rented "compound" outside of Accra. The plumbing only provided enough pressure for a trickle of water which meant it took about twenty minutes to coat the bottom of the tub with one centimeter of water. Similarly, the community center in Tamo anticipates electricity, indoor plumbing, and a time when it will be the focal point of a flourishing commercial district.

After I offered the chief the traditional two bottles of Aromatic Schiedam Schnapps and 100,000 cedes, about $11, the chief poured libations. After the ritual honor and introductions, the chief tried to regal us with the story of how the Ga-Adamgbe fought back the invading Ashanti army and won. In Tamo, the Ga surprised the Ashanti by hiding behind trees rather than attacking en mass. The Ashanti defeat affectively insured that the Ga-Adamgbe would continue to rule Southern Ghana.

After sharing their history, the chief produced the community's four year plan printed on an excel spreadsheet. Each project had an associated cost. The "potable water" project, for example, had an estimated cost of 300 million cedes, or $30,000. I began to

think that this may be my project. I could try to fund a few of their capital projects, and then follow the community for 20 years to see how the improvements changed life in Tamo.

Then the chief showed us his own extreme village makeover project. He showed us plans drafted by an architectural firm from Houston, Texas for a $200 million hotel resort and theme park. In order to bring life to the architectural renderings of the theme park and hotel, the Houston firm included pictures of smiling towheaded families in polo shirts. The tacked-on photos cut from magazines were meant to fuel the fantasies of the chief. According to the plans, the dams in Tamo would be repaired, but instead of using the water to irrigate the fields the dams would feed a man-made lake. The perimeter of the lake would be dotted with a hotel lobby, a four-star restaurant, and individual bungalows. People would paddle in paddle boats on the lake and spend a pleasurable day at the amusement park before being regaled as we were by the soporific tale of a small battle waged over a hundred years ago in a non-descript backwater of Tema. This history, while interesting in the context of a nuanced reading of Ghana's past, does not make sense to European, Asian, and American tourists who only know that the Ashanti and Ga coexist peacefully. From my perspective their project was fanciful. From their perspective my project was sophomoric.

The second village, Sesa, was an extremely poor community at the end of a long dirt road an hour outside Accra. The village was being made over by an archaeologist at the University of Ghana who discovered the remnants of a Danish plantation. Since his discovery he has received funding to restore the house and slave quarters. His goal is to attract tourists to the location, and he hopes that the money brought by tourists will circulate within the community and effectively raise the standard of living.

Having traveled around Ghana in order to get a sense of how the different regions are connected, I observed very little tourism. The hotels had low occupancies, and the tourists were primarily middle-class Ghanaians or European and American young adults experiencing Africa by working for an NGO or backpacking. In the case of both Tamo and Sesa, I was concerned that their efforts to shift to a tourist economy would produce little material wealth for the community. I hope I am wrong, but I rejected Sesa and Tamo as fieldsites primarily because I did not want to impose my vision of self-sufficiency and sustainability on a community interested in tourism.

Reminiscent of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*, the third village was just right. Yoye is a poor fishing village west of Accra. It is bordered by two extremes. To the east is an upscale suburban development of red tiled roofs and stucco walls that remind me of San Clemente, California, the hometown of President Nixon. 80% of Ghanaians are poor. Those who are not poor are often very rich, or rich enough to buy imported SUVs and houses, often in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, in cash because the interest rate on loans in Ghana is over 50%. The development east of Yoye is designed for an emerging group of solidly middle-class Ghanaians.

To the west of Yoye is a resort community built on land recently leased out by the chief of the village. Traditionally tribal land is inherited through the mother. Chiefs who are usually chosen for his leadership skills divide the land according to need. Out of desperation or greed many chiefs are beginning to lease land to the highest bidder.

The new chief of Yoye has done everything in his power to keep the land in the hands of the community, but rather than being at a crossroads, Yoye is in the crosshairs. Recently the government had to replace the chief for reasons that were never made explicit to me, but it was evident that there had been a disruption. The community was using their beach and the area around their boats as an outhouse, and this lapse in

modesty was a clear indication that something was culturally amiss. There is extreme poverty in the village, and nutritional deficiencies are reflected in the short stature of many of the children and adults. The fishing season only lasts from April through September, and during the season women who take the dried fish to market only make about 50,000 cedes/day or about $15 to $20/week. As a result of global warming, over-fishing, or natural environmental shifts, the fish catch seems to be decreasing yearly.

The community is picturesque and could easily be sold to buyers interested in beachfront property. The problem with private land ownership in Yoye is that members of the community use the land to house their fishing boats, to raise chickens, to cook, grow food, and smoke fish. The land allows self-sufficiency and so losing the land would further disfranchise the community.

I met with about 50 members of the community on the grounds of the elementary school. I asked them to tell me what their community needs. The women repeatedly said they needed a high school so that their children could learn skills other than fishing. The second thing they said was a cold store to store the fish during the off-season. The third thing they said they needed was outboard motors and new nets so that they could catch more fish.

There are numerous reasons I chose Yoye, from the urgency of their situation to the type of intervention they suggested. The school will be built by the community with the help of an architect and engineer. I am working with an African-American ex-pat who lives in the resort village to the west of Yoye. She has already built an institute using Ghanaian designs and sustainable materials including earth bricks made by Ghanaian women who wanted to start their own building supplies business.

Classes will include fish farming and catering. The fish farmed and food produced by the students will be sold and the money reinvested back into the school. In addition,

the school will teach computer science, construction, English, math, art and design. It will be built in such a way that the campus will double as a community center. I will also try to provide the fishermen with a cold store, outboard motors, and nets as part of a comparative piece to my research. The school benefits the entire community whereas the capital goods only benefit the owners of the fishing boats. I want to trace which form of intervention is most effective in increasing material wealth, one indice of social improvement.

Presenting my project to an interdisciplinary group of scholars in African Studies, I was anxious for their input, but also for their blessing. What I got was complete condemnation. An anthropologist in the audience questioned me about why a scholar of African-American studies would go to Ghana to do research. This scholar felt that my project was rooted in neocolonialist missionary zeal, and she wondered why I even cared about a group of “rogue anthropologists” who challenge the discipline (she was referring to Bourgois, Scheper-Hughes, and Farmer… and no she is not in my department). An environmental scientist told me that I could not get any useful statistical information on what forms of intervention effect what sorts of change. She told me that I should conduct a project evaluation of five NGOs. A psychologist told me that I knew nothing about assessing the needs of stakeholders and that I needed an instrument to assess high risk youth. He directed me to the Society for Community Research and Action a division of the American Psychological Association. The other website he sent me to was the Community Tool Box which provided basic skills in, among other things, “strategic planning” and “effective advocacy.” The information in the Community Tool Box was interesting, but programmatic and rigid.

After reading through the websites, I noted that the language of development deploys science jargon as a way to protect the researcher-activist. The emotional, philosophical,

and religious reasons for wanting to help the world have been wrung out of development-speak leaving only the dry desiccated language of “social marketing,” “group facilitation,” and “maintaining success.” This discourse represents an awkward attempt to distance the motivations of policy experts from the motivations of missionaries. But is not the purpose of both to save souls?

I am not fully ready to respond to my critics. That is the point of my study. My goal is to better understand the motivations of all involved and to study what types of exchange produce what types of outcomes. The goal is not to produce an operationalizable model program, but to consider how intervention on the part of an anthropologist affects sociality, subjectivity and agency.[16]

Conclusion

In 1990, theater producer Peter Sellars put on a festival in and around Los Angeles celebrating dance, music, and drama from around the world. When introducing an Aborigine dance troupe, Sellars said that he first saw the group perform in the Australian outback. In response to Sellar’s invitation to participate in the Los Angeles Festival, rather than a simple, yes, no, or maybe, the troupe leader said, “You will have to check with our agent first.”

Now this story could be apocryphal, or Sellars could have just found a clever way to introduce the performers. Or the troupe leader could have just been joking by imitating what he knows about “Hollywood.” Regardless, the story demonstrates that if you randomly pick any two points on the global you will find that their economies intersect. Taking Marcel Mauss’ theory of exchange seriously, where there are overlapping

[16] In the 1980s philanthropist Eugene Lang developed one of the first mentorship programs for poor children. He promised the children that if they did well enough in school to be accepted into college that he would pay for their education. Almost every one of his mentees went to college. Other philanthropists tried to reproduce his model and failed. The possible explanation; Eugene Lang actually got involved in the life of the children he mentored. The others just promised money. Possible lesson; the unquantifiable aspects of intervention are what makes a successful program.

economies there are overlapping moral and ethical universes (Mauss 1990). My interventionist project recognizes that my interlocutors and I are embedded in intersecting exchange economies, and therefore some form of reciprocity is mandatory (Appadurai 1986; Godelier 1999).[17] In this respect the rogue anthropologists are right. We must find ways as anthropologists to give back to the communities we work with and if there is tremendous violence or suffering it is incumbent upon us to do something about it.

The requirements for reciprocity continue to grow with increasing access to the World Wide Web. The Web provides easy access to the articles we write, photos we post, and documentaries we create. David Mosse has observed first hand how powerful informants resist anthropological boundary-making.[18] But even interlocutors with less social and material capital are, for example, more familiar with exchange rates and know how much money "Edgar" in the next village received for his interview. After the movie *Borat*, I am not sure any visual anthropologist will be able to get away with verbal consent. Arguing that we need to rearrange and reframe fieldwork and "writing" given new challenges in the field, Mosse argues that we must first acknowledge, "how fieldwork relations shape writing," and second, "how writing now alters relationships of 'the field.'"[19]

The anthropology of suffering that I have proposed is radical in that it 1. overtly recognizes what Godelier terms the "social existence" of the other by being attentive to multiple forms of economic and symbolic exchange.[20] 2. Attempts to alleviate suffering, while maintaining a cultural relativist approach to understanding and writing about suffering. 3. Acknowledges that the methods and forms of engagement are entirely

[17] *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, edited by Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, Translated by Nora Scott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999)
[18] David Mosse. 2006. "Anti-social anthropology? Objectivity, objection, and the ethnography of public policy and professional communities." In *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 12, 935-956.
[19] Ibid., 936.
[20] Maurice Godelier, *The Enigma of the Gift*, Translated by Nora Scott (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999)

qualitative and unsystematic. 4. Requires a self-reflexive examination of all the ways in which intervening to help a community or an individual affects sociality, knowledge production, and suffering.